Case 2:23-cv-02280-MEMF-SK Document 33	Filed 05/15/23 Page 1 of 2 Page ID #:8601
	DISTRICT COURT CT OF CALIFORNIA
	CASE NUMBER
Amber Doe,	CV 23-02280-MEMF (SK)
PLAINTIFF(S)	C V 23 02200 MEM (6H)
v.	
Michael Lewis Goguen et al,	ORDER STRIKING DOCUMENT FROM
DEFENDANT(S).	THE RECORD
WHEDEAS the decument listed below was imp	roporly submitted for the following reason:
WHEREAS, the document listed below was imp No ex parte communications with the Court.	roperty submitted for the following reason.
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the document si considered by the Court:	hall be stricken from the record and shall not be
considered by the Court.	
Document Entitled	Submitted
Plaintiff's ex parte email to the Court	May 15, 2023
Thinking on passe than to me come	
-	
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the document	shall not be returned to the filing party; however, the
Clerk shall note on the case docket that the document is	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
15 45 2022	Jana .
May 15, 2023 Date	Steve Kim, U.S. Magistrate Judge
Dun	211. V IIIII, U.S. IIIugibilate vaage

Connie Chung

From: Amber Doe <amberlitigate@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 15, 2023 11:43 AM

To: SK Chambers; Kelly Davis; MEMFChambers

Subject: Motion Hearing date Request For Default Judgement.

CAUTION - EXTERNAL:

Dear Deputy Clerk Chung

Please appoint me a date for my motion for default to be heard. It has been 45 days since served the Defendants. They have not answered my case nor have any of them had any of their representatives sign onto the case and contact me. I have no choice but to represent myself in the instant case as the lawyers have tampered with and bribed the lawyers that I previously hired.

I do not qualify for public Counsel or Legal aid as I am Suing Lawyers.

The law states they most answer my complaint within 30 days of service or I may file for default judgement on the 31st day. It is now day 45. The only correspondence that I have received from the Lawyers is that they allege that my communications with the lawyers in this case and Law enforcement is "Defamatory" and it is not.

This Egregious litigation situation began in 2014 so it is not a day too early for my Default Judgement. The "lawyers" still refuse to serve me the 765 docket entries on the case in The Orange County Court where I am the defendant in a 100 million dollar lawsuit filed by the "Lawyers".

The "lawyers" refuse to serve me in the San Mateo Case where I am the Plaintiff.

The "lawyers" refuse to serve me in the instant case in the Los Angeles District Court and gave me zero notice of any hearings or pleadings that have been signed By Honorable Justice Steve Kim.

Please appoint me the soonest possible hearing date for my motion for default Judgement to be heard/granted.

Thank You Amber Doe

CAUTION - EXTERNAL EMAIL: This email originated outside the Judiciary. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking on links.